



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 03-06

Paper No: \_\_\_\_

**COPY MAILED**

**MAR 30 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

CHRISTOPHER L. JOHNSON  
KIRTON & MCCONKIE  
SUITE 1800  
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111

In re Application of	:	
Segota, et al.	:	DECISION
Application No.: 10/600,206	:	
Filing Date: 19 June, 2003	:	
Attorney Docket No. 11023.5	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed on 15 February, 2006, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) and seeking to revive an application abandoned due to unintentional delay.

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

**BACKGROUND**

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to a Restriction requirement mailed by the Examiner on 15 December, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before Monday, 15 February, 2005;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 15 February, 2005;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 30 June, 2005;

- Petitioner filed the instant petition on 15 February, 2006, with fee and reply in the form of an election and made the statement of unintentional delay.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>1</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>2</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>3</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>4</sup> And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>5</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>6</sup>))

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>3</sup> See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

<sup>6</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) requires a petition, fee, statement of unintentional delay, reply, and a terminal disclaimer and fee if appropriate.

The record (including the petition filed on 15 February, 2006) does not necessitate a finding that the delay between midnight 15 February, 2005(date of abandonment), and 15 February, 2006 (date of filing of grantable petition), was not unintentional.

Rather, the Patent and Trademark Office is relying in this matter on duty of candor and good faith of Applicants Darko Segota and John W. Finnegan II and their Counsel Petitioner Michael F. Krieger (Reg. No. 35,232) when accepting their representation that the delay in filing the response was unintentional.<sup>7</sup>

Therefore, Petitioner is considered to have satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The application is released to Technology Center 3600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>7</sup> See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).